

**Missouri Standards for Teacher Education Programs
(MoSTEP)**

Institutional Handbook

**The Missouri Department of Elementary
and Secondary Education**

**Division of Teacher Quality and Urban Education
Educator Preparation Section**

March 2004

Acknowledgments

The Missouri Standards for Teacher Education Programs (MoSTEP) were developed by a task force of representatives from all of the teacher preparation institutions in Missouri, as well as K-12 educators and administrators, representatives from two-year colleges, and from the Department of Higher Education (DHE). The Missouri State Board of Education (MSBE) adopted the MoSTEP Standards and Procedures in Rule 5 CSR 80-805.015 in May of 1999.

This MoSTEP *Institutional Handbook* is published by the Educator Preparation Section (EPS) of the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE). The initial draft of the *Handbook* was written by Michael L. Walker (Columbia, MO) and Bill R. Foster (St. Louis, MO), co-founders of Educational Development Projects and consultants for the Educator Preparation Section.

The *Handbook's* outline and portions of the text and are adapted from the *Handbook for the Board of Examiners* and *Handbook for Continuing Accreditation Visits*, published by the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE).

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| Introduction..... | 1 |
| Conditions and Procedures for Approving Professional Education Programs | 2 |
| Site Visit Protocol and Timeline | 5 |
| The Standards..... | 7 |
| The Site Visit Coordinator | 7 |
| Selecting a Date for the Site Visit..... | 7 |
| Selection of Candidate Portfolios for Examination | 7 |
| Arranging for and Conducting the Pre-Visit Meeting..... | 8 |
| Site Visit Logistics..... | 8 |
| More About the Team Work Rooms and Exhibit Room | 10 |
| Suggestions for Compiling Material for Each Program..... | 11 |
| Selection and Appointment of Examining Team Members | 12 |
| Unit and Program Documentation Reviewed Prior to and During the Site Visit | 12 |
| Standard by Standard Highlights | 15 |
| Issues to Address in the Unit's Outline of the Institutional Report | 15 |
| Conducting the Site Visit | 17 |
| Interviews..... | 18 |
| Classroom Observations | 18 |
| Visits to Field Sites | 18 |
| Branch Campuses, Off-campus Programs, and Distance Learning Programs..... | 18 |
| The Exit Conference | 19 |
| The MoSTEP Examiner's Report..... | 19 |
| Institutional Rejoinder to the MoSTEP Examiners' Report | 20 |
| Appendices: | |
| Appendix A – Procedures for Initial Program Approval | |
| Appendix B – The Standards | |
| Appendix C – Rubrics for Unit Standards | |
| Appendix D – Rubrics for Teacher Candidate Portfolios (Standard 1.2) | |
| Appendix E – Rubrics for School Administrator Candidate Portfolios (Standard 1.3) | |
| Appendix F – Rubrics for School Counselor Candidate Portfolios (Standard 1.4) | |
| Appendix G – Rubrics for School Library-Media Specialist Portfolios (Standard 1.5) | |
| Appendix H – Curriculum Matrix Template for Professional/Pedagogical Competencies | |
| Appendix I – Curriculum Matrix Template for Subject Knowledge Competencies | |
| Appendix J – Sample Annual Report Form | |
| Appendix K – Previsit Agenda & Checklist | |
| Appendix L – Sample Schedule for the Site Visit | |
| Appendix M – Interview Schedule Template | |
| Appendix N – Glossary | |

Introduction

In Missouri, state statute provides that *the State Board of Education shall establish standards and procedures by which it will evaluate all teacher training institutions for the approval of teacher education programs* (Section 161.097 RSMo). The statute also provides that *any person who graduates from an approved program, and who meets other requirements, which the state board of education shall prescribe by rule, regulation and statute shall be granted a certificate of license to teach in the public schools of this state.*

The Missouri State Board of Education (MSBE) must approve every professional education unit and its programs for certification before its graduates can be recommended for state professional licensure. This approval is based on expectations and guidelines for unit viability and performance as set forth in statute (Section 161.099 RSMo) and the Missouri Standards for Teacher Education Programs (MoSTEP), which are incorporated by reference in MSBE Rule 5 CSR 80-805.015. MSBE approval of professional education programs may be attained by complying with the standards and procedures outlined in this document.

The Site Visit is the most critical component of the program approval process--the mandatory peer review of the Professional Education Unit and its constituent programs at a college or university. The final determination is made by the MSBE, based on the Examiners' Report that includes information from observations and judgments made during the site visit and from additional information included in the Unit's Rejoinder to the Examiners' Report.

Each professional education program must address specific certification requirements for courses, competencies and field experiences established by the MSBE. Because Missouri has implemented a performance-based program approval system, MoSTEP has nested within it quality indicators for beginning teachers, administrators, counselors, library/media specialists, and others. Each Unit and program must undergo a process of initial and continuing approval, based on the MoSTEP Standards and Quality Indicators, in order to verify its capacity to prepare professional educators ready to assume their professional roles in Missouri's public schools.

In reviews for both initial approval and continuing approval of an institution's programs, the visiting team must examine a number of exhibits and consider the data presented (curriculum matrices, entry and exit test scores, candidate portfolios, survey results, etc.), as well as observe the Unit's efforts firsthand via interviews and observations, in order to effectively evaluate the Unit's compliance with the standards and its ability to carry out the important task of preparing professional educators. The data and findings of the institution allow the team members to use their professional judgment to rate the performance of the Unit in accordance with the standards and make recommendations to the MSBE as to whether or not it should continue to approve the Unit and its programs. The findings of the Examining Team and its resulting recommendations are also reported to the Unit's head and the institutional administration.

Obviously, much rests on the site visit, so the Unit must begin well in advance of the site visit to prepare for its review, hence the need for this *Handbook* and the attendant workshops. Each has been created to help institutions and their Professional Education Units understand the standards against which both Units and programs are judged, as well as the process by which the evaluation is accomplished.

CONDITIONS AND PROCEDURES FOR APPROVING PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS IN MISSOURI

Conditions for Approval of Professional Education Programs

1. Conditions requiring state program approval

Professional education program approval is required:

- a. when an institution proposes to offer a program for certification not currently approved by the Missouri State Board of Education (MSBE);
- b. at the time of renewal of MSBE approval granted initially through Procedures and Standards for Approval of Professional Education Programs in Missouri;
- c. when an institution significantly modifies the content, experiences, sequence or procedures of an approved program;
- d. when a substantive change occurs which alters an institution's mission, scope, control, or personnel;
- e. when an institution establishes a professional education certification program at a new geographical location; and
- f. when an institution establishes an alternative program for certification.

2. Terms for awarding approval or conditional approval to the professional education unit and programs for certification

The State Board of Education may grant or deny approval of a profession education program under the following terms:

- a. Approval may be granted for five (5) or seven (7) years when a unit and its programs are in compliance with the Standards, whereupon the institution is authorized to recommend candidates for certification during the approved period;
- b. Provisional approval may be granted for a period not to exceed two (2) years when the unit or any of its programs is not in compliance with one or more of the Standards, but the institution provides evidence of plans and resources to meet the standards, whereupon the institution is authorized to continue to recommend candidates for certification during the conditional approval period;
- c. Approval may be denied when a unit or any of its programs fails to meet a sufficient number of the Standards, whereupon the unit or program would surrender its authority to recommend candidates for certification.

3. Use of approval status in institutional publications

An institution shall indicate in its publications, including catalogs:

- a. the level of MSBE approval (approved, conditionally approved, not approved) and the term of approval (e.g. 5 years, 2 years) for each professional education program offered by the institution;
- b. certifications and grade levels associated with each professional education program offered;
- c. any professional education programs offered at the institution but not approved by the MSBE.

4. Annual reports

Institutions with state-approved professional education programs shall submit annual reports on or before November 15 of each year using the Annual Report Form provided by the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE). The institution will report on any changes made in the unit and/or its programs, on new initiatives undertaken during the past year, and on progress made toward addressing weaknesses cited as a result of the previous review. (See Appendix J)

5. Interim review of professional education units or programs

- a. If a professional education unit or a program for certification undergoes changes that might adversely affect its compliance with MoSTEP during the five-year approval period, the Commissioner of Education may authorize an interim review of the unit or the program.
- b. Subsequent to the review, and upon the recommendation of the Commissioner of Education, the MSBE may withdraw its approval for the program, and authorization to recommend candidates for certification from the program would be discontinued.

6. Withdrawal of Programs

An institution wishing to have state approval of a professional education certification program withdrawn shall submit written notification to the Director of Educator Preparation, Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, and shall request that the program be removed from the Missouri Directory of Approved Professional Education Programs. The notification shall also stipulate the date of termination.

Procedures for Obtaining Approval of Professional Education Programs

1. Initial state approval for institutions

- a. An institution seeking initial approval for its professional education unit and programs(s) shall submit a letter requesting initial approval to the Director of Educator Preparation in the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education and include a proposal according to the procedures and criteria outlined in Appendix A.
- b. The Educator Preparation Section (EPS) will evaluate the institution's proposal, and if it is determined to be viable, a representative from the Section will conduct an initial site inspection at the institution.
- c. The EPS may request additional information or clarification about elements in the proposal, or as a result of the site inspection.
- d. If the institution's proposal is determined to be acceptable and the site inspection is satisfactory, a recommendation for interim approval will be made to the MSBE for its consideration, and if interim approval is granted, the institution may begin recommending candidates for state certification upon their completion of the program(s).
- e. The interim approval shall be in effect until a standard review of the unit and its program(s) is conducted and the results presented to the MSBE.

2. Adding new professional education programs

- a. An MSBE-approved institution seeking to add a new professional certification program(s) shall submit a written request for approval, accompanied by a proposal and supporting documentation, to the Director of Educator Preparation.
- b. The Educator Preparation Section will evaluate the institution's proposal, and if it is determined to be acceptable, the institution will be granted interim approval to offer the new program, whereupon the institution may recommend candidates for certification from the new program.
- c. The interim approval for the new program(s) shall be in effect until the next regularly scheduled review of the unit and its programs(s) is conducted and the results are presented to the MSBE.

3. Alternative Programs

Alternative programs administered by the professional education unit that culminate in the recommendation of candidates for state certification must comply with state standards and must be included in the MoSTEP review, in the same manner as other programs. MoSTEP examiners may cite areas for improvement related to any specific programs, including alternative programs.

Missouri Standards for Teacher Education Programs (MoSTEP)

Site Visit and Program Approval Timeline

1. One year preceding an anticipated site visit, the Educator Preparation Section (EPS) in the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) will notify the institution's professional education unit head as a reminder of the review and requesting date preferences for the site visit. The institution will submit a letter to the EPS acknowledging the upcoming review and indicating three date preferences (1st, 2nd, and 3rd choices) for the site visit. The EPS will schedule a date according to the preferences of the institution, and will inform the institution in writing regarding the selected date.
2. One year preceding its scheduled site visit, the institution submits to the EPS a list of candidates expected to graduate and be recommended for professional certificates (for all programs for initial certification, i.e., teacher, administrator, counselor, etc.). Using a random selection process EPS selects candidates from each program who will provide portfolios for examination by the visiting team.
3. At least sixty (60) days before the scheduled visit, the EPS sends to the institution a roster of MoSTEP examiners tentatively selected for the site visit.
4. Within ten (10) days of receiving the tentative team roster, the institution responds to EPS with any concerns regarding the composition of its assigned examining team; EPS finalizes the examining team roster.
5. Thirty (30) to sixty (60) days prior to the site visit, the MoSTEP Team Chair and the DESE consultant conduct a pre-visit meeting with the institution's site visit coordinator to discuss logistics of the site visit.
6. At least fourteen (14) days in advance of the pre-visit, the institution should send the DESE consultant and the team chair a copy (or draft) of the Institutional Report for their review.
7. Approximately thirty (30) days prior to the site visit, the institution distributes its Institutional Report (5th Year Report) to each member of the MoSTEP team. DESE distributes the institution's annual reports to each team member. Team members individually review the Institutional Report and annual reports, formulating questions they wish to pursue during the site visit.
8. Initiating the site visit, team members arrive on Saturday to meet each other, receive orientation to the site, review examiner training and evaluation components, and begin reviewing candidate portfolios. Additional portfolio reviewers may be brought to the site as needed on Saturday and Sunday, but will not continue with the team for the remainder of site visit.
9. The team reviews candidate portfolios Saturday evening and Sunday morning. Late Sunday morning, the team members compile and discuss the results of the portfolio reviews.
10. The team spends Sunday afternoon examining additional documentation in exhibits area. Additional portfolio reviewers (if present) will depart Sunday afternoon.
11. Sunday evening, the team meets to discuss initial perceptions of the level of the unit's compliance with the standards and initial evaluations of individual programs; team members further refine questions to be pursued; assignments are made for group and individual interviews, site visits to schools, etc. during the next two days.
12. Monday-Tuesday, the team continues its investigation, including, but not limited to, (a) interviewing college faculty, administration, students, public school personnel, advisory groups, committees, etc. (b) sitting in on classes (c) touring campus sites (d) visiting clinical sites; etc.
13. Tuesday night, the team meets to discuss their findings and decide the unit's and the individual programs' compliance with standards. Team members complete writing assignments.

14. Wednesday morning, the team members read their individual drafts for the team report. The team chair and the state consultant present the team's findings to institution officials. The team departs campus.
15. After the site visit, the team chair compiles the findings into a "first draft" of the *MoSTEP Examiners' Report* and submits a copy to the institution's unit head to examine and make factual corrections. A copy is also sent to the DESE consultant.
16. Within ten (10) days the institution will make its factual corrections to the MoSTEP Examiners Report draft and return it to the Educator Preparation Section at DESE. The draft is revised and sent to the team members for proofing.
17. Within thirty (30) days of the site visit, the final official report is prepared and sent to the unit head and other appropriate officials of the institution, and for joint reviews, to the BOE Chair to include as the state's addendum to the Board of Examiners' Report, which is submitted to NCATE.
18. Upon receipt of the official MoSTEP Examiners' Report, the institution has 30 days to submit a letter indicating its acceptance of the Report or to submit a written rejoinder.
19. As soon as possible following receipt of the institution's rejoinder, the EPS schedules a presentation of the institution for consideration for approval on the agenda of the Missouri State Board of Education (MSBE) and submits a summary of the MoSTEP Examiners' Report and the institution's rejoinder. The MSBE will consider the team's recommendation for each program and grant Approval or Conditional Approval, or it will Deny Approval for each program respectively.
20. For programs granted conditional approval, the institution is given two (2) years to correct the area(s) for improvement cited. If a subsequent site-visit may be necessary, the sequence of events will follow the steps described in 1-18, except that the visit will focus only on unit standards that were not met, the programs with conditional approval and the area(s) for improvement cited.
21. The five-year cycle starts over.

The Standards

The Missouri Standards for Teacher Education Programs (MoSTEP) are the standards that Examining Teams must use to review professional education units and programs seeking approval to recommend candidates for professional certification by the MSBE. (See Appendix B, *Missouri Standards for Teacher Education Programs*) MoSTEP is a set of standards statements, quality indicators, and performance indicators intended to clearly define the MSBE's expectations for how units and programs are to be structured and implemented, and the quality of the professional candidates they prepare. Institutions seeking accreditation from the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) may substitute the NCATE Standards for its professional education unit

For the institution and team's convenience, rubrics for the Unit standards and for the beginning teacher Quality Indicators have been developed and are made available for use by the unit in preparing for the site visit and for application during the site visit (See Appendices C, D, E, F & G).

The standards, procedures, and rubrics comprising MoSTEP were developed, reviewed and recommended to the MSBE by representatives of the teacher preparation institutions in Missouri, as well as representatives from K-12 schools, representatives of two-year colleges and a representative of the Missouri Department of Higher Education (DHE). The MSBE adopted the MoSTEP Procedures and Standards in 1999, which was the pilot year of the system's implementation. DESE began full implementation of MoSTEP in January 2000.

The first five years of full implementation are viewed by DESE and the MSBE as formative years, allowing Units to begin refining their programs, policies and procedures to reflect the new standards. During the first five years, considered initial visits for all institutions, teams will be looking for progress and planning toward full compliance with MoSTEP, as well as the quality of existing programs. Reviews subsequent to the first five years of MoSTEP will be considered continuing visits.

The Site Visit Coordinator

As the institution begins to prepare for its MoSTEP review a Site Visit Coordinator should be designated by the professional education unit to oversee and facilitate the activities in preparation for the review. Although the unit head frequently serves in this role, other faculty members may serve in this capacity as well. The coordinator will be the contact person for the DESE staff, the Examining Team Chairperson, and all other individuals involved in the MoSTEP review.

Selecting a Date for the Site Visit

The MoSTEP on-site review is generally scheduled for the same semester five years after the preceding site visit. However, DESE may grant a postponement of up to two semesters for good cause. In addition there may be times when DESE and/or other accrediting bodies (e.g., NCATE) may request a delay of a visit.

One year prior to the semester of an institutional review, the Director of Teacher Education at DESE will notify the unit head of the anticipated site visit. The unit head is expected to respond to the Educator Preparation Section (EPS) acknowledging the upcoming review and indicating three date preferences (1st, 2nd, and 3rd choices) for the site visit. The EPS will schedule a date according to the preferences of the institution and will inform the institution in writing regarding the selected date. Institutions seeking NCATE accreditation will coordinate with both NCATE and DESE in scheduling the dates for their site visit.

Selection of Candidate Portfolios for Examination

One year prior to the semester of the anticipated site visit, the institution shall submit to the EPS a list of candidates expected to complete their professional education programs and receive a recommendation for their professional certificates representing the full academic year preceding the semester of the site visit (includes all programs for initial certification categories, i.e., teacher, administrator, counselor, etc.). Using a random selection process, the EPS will select from each represented program candidates who will provide portfolios for examination by the visiting team.

Arranging for and Conducting the Pre-visit Meeting

Approximately thirty (30) to sixty (60) days prior to the site visit, DESE will conduct a pre-visit meeting with the institution's site visit coordinator and the MoSTEP Team Chair to discuss logistics of the site visit. The unit's site visit coordinator will jointly arrange the pre-visit with the DESE consultant and the team chair. (He/she will coordinate this visit with the team chair and NCATE BOE Chair, if applicable). The site coordinator should contact the EPS at least 120 days prior to the site visit to arrange for this meeting. Depending on the location of the institution and the home site of the team chair and the DESE consultant, the site visit coordinator should consider whether the team chair and the DESE consultant may require accommodations the evening prior to the pre-visit meeting. **At least fourteen (14) days in advance of the pre-visit, the institution should send the team chair and DESE consultant a copy (or draft) of the Institutional Report for their review.** Based on the decisions made during this pre-visit meeting, the unit's site visit coordinator should make all arrangements to ensure the smooth running of the site visit.

The pre-visit meeting should be attended by the team chair, the DESE representative, the unit head, the site visit coordinator, and appropriate institutional representatives. (For a joint NCATE/DESE visit, the NCATE chair will work with the MoSTEP team chair and the DESE representative to arrange for this visit.) Issues that should be addressed in this meeting appear in the checklist in Appendix K. The institution is responsible for all costs in conjunction with the pre-visit.

During the pre-visit, the team chair and DESE consultant should meet with the president/provost/chancellor of the institution. The DESE consultant will provide an overview of the site visit and answer questions about MoSTEP and the review process. The team chair will inquire into what the institution's head would like to learn from the visit. This meeting allows institutional administrators to be aware of the kinds of information being sought and reviewed during the site visit.

Site Visit Logistics

The following list should guide the site visit coordinator in making the necessary arrangements:

➔ **Make hotel/motel arrangements** for all team members and DESE representatives. Examining Team members will make their own travel arrangements for traveling to the institution. The Unit being visited will reimburse team members for reasonable travel expenses, such as mileage and meals not provided by the Unit. The Unit will also make all hotel arrangements (single rooms) for the team; these are usually direct billed to the college or university being visited. The team will also be provided with a meeting room with computer and printer at the hotel. Team members are responsible for any personal expenses incurred during the site visit (e.g., personal telephone charges). Team members normally arrive on Saturday and depart on Wednesday.

The following suggestions should assist in determining the selection of a hotel and the logistical preparations for the visit:

- The hotel should be located near the campus in order to minimize travel time.
- A private single room should be reserved for each site team member.
- A meeting room where team members may work upon their arrival should be reserved. This room should be available for the entire length of the site visit so that materials and equipment may be left there.
- The team chair should be consulted regarding how he/she would like the meeting room arranged and the types of supplies and equipment that will be needed (computers, printers, paper, pens and pencils, notepads, and refreshments). At least one computer with laser printer and one telephone should be available in the hotel meeting room.
- Because meals are often used as work sessions, there should be a restaurant in or near the hotel. Except for Sunday night, the institutional representatives should not eat meals with the team members.
- Direct billing of team hotel expenses to the university/college should be made, so team members do not have to pay these costs out of their own pockets. (The DESE consultant and DHE Representative are exceptions.)
- Provide all team members with clear directions to the hotel and campus.
- Arrange for transportation between the hotel and the institution for the duration of the site visit. Sometimes the provision of a van or station wagon for team use is helpful.

➔ **Make the following arrangements on campus:**

- **Set up a campus workroom for the Examining Team.** This room will likely double as the exhibits room, but it should not be used for individual or group interviews. The work room at the institution should be located within the Unit and be close to interview locations and administrative offices; moreover, it should have internet access to allow members to get information from the DESE website and to gain access to e-mail. The work room should have at least one telephone. This room should allow privacy for team discussion and deliberations and be secured when the team is not present. The team chair should be given a key to the room for easy access. *The workroom and exhibits room need to be accessible on Saturday and Sunday.*
- **Set up an exhibits room at the institution.** The unit should set up an exhibits room at the institution containing all necessary information for the site team to conduct its paper review of the unit and its programs. The Unit should clearly mark and organize all items in the exhibit room, arranging them in order of the standards. Materials in the exhibit room should include but not be limited to the following:
 - List of all exhibits with titles and location in the room (a copy for each team member)
 - List of people scheduled for each interview (a copy for each team member)
 - Course syllabi for all professional education courses and other courses required for licensure (undergraduate and graduate)
 - Faculty vitae for all full- and part-time professional education and other faculty teaching courses required for licensure
 - Files or folios that include curriculum matrices for all certification programs being reviewed during the site visit (See Appendix H & I)
 - Evaluation instruments and results of evaluations for both faculty and programs (*note: these are to be disaggregated by program*)
 - College catalogs and student advisement sheets
 - Documentation for each standard
 - Faculty and staff directory (with telephone numbers and office hours during the site visit)
 - List of courses in session during the site visit, location of classes (full building name and room number), and faculty members teaching the courses
 - Minutes of advisory and policy-making committees
 - Candidate Portfolios (determined by the DESE sampling)
 - Student handbooks, student teaching handbooks, and other information (recruitment or program-related) given to students relevant to their program of study
 - Faculty handbook
 - Budget information for the Unit and for faculty professional development
 - Long-range plan
 - Professional development school partnership information
- **Support services for the Examining Team.** Such support might include the following:
 - Support staff assistance
 - Access to photocopying facilities
 - Arrangements for off-campus visits
 - Arrangements for visits to professional education classes
 - Access to teachers, student teachers, recent graduates, and principals, especially those used for field-based experiences. The Unit should provide a list of schools used for these purposes and the characteristics of the schools (e.g., location, diversity of student population, and types of field experiences). Team members will visit some of these schools during the course of the site visit. *Note: schools chosen for visits should require no more than fifteen minutes travel time each way.*
 - Access to students and faculty records on campus
- **Noon meals** — Arrange in consultation with the team chair.
- **Nametags** for the examining team, so they can be clearly identified by institutional personnel. Name tags should not identify the institutional affiliation of the team member; rather, they should identify them only as members of the DESE Examining Team. Also, consider asking faculty to wear nametags during the site visit, particularly in group-interview settings.

- **Interviews and off-campus visits** in consultation with the DESE representative and site team chair. (Transportation to off-campus sites and distant interviews should also be arranged.)
 - **Schedule of interviews.** Using the Interview Schedule Template (See Appendix M), schedule interviews with groups and individuals identified during the pre-visit meeting with the team chair.
 - Arrange to talk with institution administrators, unit administrators and staff, professional education faculty, Arts and Sciences department chairs and faculty, student teachers, candidates, recent graduates, supervising/cooperating teachers, principals, advisory board members, and other relevant stakeholders. Team members need to interview as many faculty and students as possible on Monday and Tuesday. Faculty interviewed should be from different ranks and disciplines as a cross-section of the Unit.
 - Based on the portfolio reading and other document findings, the team may require interviews to be scheduled in addition to the customary interviews (i.e., faculty, students, graduates, etc.). The team chair will make the campus liaison aware of these needs as soon as possible to give him/her reasonable time to arrange the interviews.
 - Provide clear directions and/or escorts to scheduled interviews.
- ➔ **Plan for the Sunday evening function** with the team chair and the DESE consultant.
- This could be a dinner held in a private dining room at the hotel, a local restaurant or on campus. If the faculty is very numerous, it may be better to have only area leaders and significant administrators and staff attend the dinner. This dinner meeting should last no longer than two hours, allowing ample time for a Sunday evening team meeting after the meal. If dinner is not in the hotel, arrange transportation for the team to the dinner.
 - Another option for this function is a working dinner featuring a buffet “finger foods” in conjunction with a poster session held on campus exhibiting the various programs within the unit. This has proven to be much more meaningful and a better use of time than a formal dinner.
 - During this function, Examining Team members will be introduced to faculty members, administrators and other stakeholders, and the team chair will give a brief overview of the site visit intent and process. Unit representatives are introduced, and the Unit may make a brief presentation regarding the Unit and the institution.

More About the Team Work Rooms and Exhibit Room

The team work room and exhibit room need to be well organized to make team members comfortable, to provide them easy access to the materials they need to carry out their duties, and to make available any technology they may need to complete their work. The room needs to be well lit and the temperature comfortable. It must have a door that can be locked, and each team member should be given a key for easy access to the room. The room should be located with easy access to restrooms and interview rooms, as well as other facilities. The room should have a large table for team meetings with seating to accommodate all team members. The room should be equipped with a telephone, at least one computer with Internet access, a laser printer interfaced with the computer, and a television/VCR setup to play candidate videotapes, if they are available. Finally the room should be supplied with snacks and drinks throughout the days of use by the team.

Exhibits should be organized in the work room/exhibit room for easy access and use by the examining team. The exhibits should include all documentation requested by the team chair prior to the site visit, as well as additional information the team might find useful. This is not to say that the room needs to be loaded with extraneous documents; rather, it should allow team members to find what they need without asking. All exhibits must be clearly marked as to their exact content and coded to match the standards/programs they are documenting. Both team members and some institutions have found it valuable to create program folios containing all the information a reviewer will need to review any specific program. This will include syllabi, survey data (disaggregated by program and level), curriculum matrices, advising sheets, entrance and exit scores (for five years disaggregated by program and level), and faculty evaluations. A list of all exhibits, including where they may be found in the work room/exhibit room, should be provided to each team member. This will allow team members to independently find the documents they need, and it will allow them to keep an accurate record of all the documents they review.

Suggestions for Compiling Material for Each Program for Certification

Since MoSTEP team members write two levels of report (unit & program), it would be advisable to assist their efforts by providing them information in both forms and in a way that facilitates their work. One way to accomplish that is to locate all information related to a program in a single place, i.e., a three-ring binder for each program. These notebooks would be in addition (and admittedly in some instances redundant) to the information compiled for the Unit as a whole. For programs being implemented on more than the main campus site, tabs would be inserted to report site-specific information. In addition to serving as the central repository for information about a program, this notebook provides program faculty opportunity to analyze the effectiveness of their curriculum and instruction decisions as reflected in the performance of candidates (and recent graduates). It is important to remember that program and unit faculty must interpret (vs. merely present) their information and findings for the team.

The following represents information artifacts to be presented *and analyzed* for each certification program:

1. Description of the program (including, but not limited to, how it realizes the vision of educator preparation articulated in the unit's Conceptual Framework, e.g., how the program embodies the national standards for the program's area (e.g., NAEYC, NCSS, NCTM, NCTE, NSTA, etc.); how program & course outcomes, field experiences, & student evaluation (campus & clinical) are aligned to the professional knowledge base upon which the unit's goals and beliefs are constructed, etc. (This is analogous to the current SPA language of establishing a program's "context.")
2. Program requirements (e.g., an "advising sheet") & variations for those programs offered as endorsements (including verification that both "major" & endorsement satisfy DESE course- & credit-hour based certification requirements)
3. Characteristics of program candidates: number of candidates in process, diversity, characteristics, entrance test scores (C-BASE) and other entrance data and processing (e.g., ACT, GPA, entrance interview, entrance portfolio, etc.)
4. Description of program assessments (including, but not limited to, benchmarks, used to promote & advise students throughout the program, particularly highlighting performance-based benchmarks, etc., formative portfolio, program-wide assessments, etc) and examples of course-level performance-based assessments (case studies, inquiry projects, field-based assignments)
5. Course list (e.g., from catalog copy, including when courses are offered during the semester of the site visit)
6. Curriculum matrices for both subject-matter & pedagogy – including courses that "all" students take versus just those courses taken by majors, e.g., Foundations or Measurement (See Appendices H & I)
7. Descriptions of field experiences including timing within students' career, evaluation forms used for field experiences (both pre-student teaching & student teaching), role of college faculty (subject-matter & education) in evaluating students' performances in field experiences
8. Syllabi for all courses¹ (subject-matter and "education") taken by majors.
9. Description of "technologies" students within program are taught to integrate into their teaching (particularly highlighting instructional technologies specific to the subject area & level of students' teaching)
10. Description of how candidates are being prepared to perform successfully in diverse classrooms. Although this section would logically refer to a section on clinical experiences, it should also reveal a faculty committed to preparing its graduates for the many different realities exhibited in Missouri classrooms.
11. Information about faculty: vitae for program faculty (full-, part-time, adjunct; content & professional ed) who teach the courses taken by students in that program; demographic characteristics of faculty; documentation of program faculty's involvement in the public schools and in the larger 'professional community'; summary (e.g., a table) of program faculty's scholarly activity, individual professional development activities, student teaching supervising responsibilities, advising responsibilities (number of advisees), process by which program evaluates teaching; involvement in beginning teacher assistance program (i.e., role and responsibilities of

¹ Syllabi should include courses objectives aligned to subject-specific competencies and/or MoSTEP Quality & Performance Indicators, assignments, readings, (when appropriate) field experiences associates with the course, etc.

content and education faculty in providing support for graduates; see MoSTEP 4.5) ; description of training/orientation efforts for part-time faculty; information about how the full-time faculty involve part-time faculty in the community of scholarship.

12. Program completers data:
 - a. Summaries of exit test scores (i.e., Praxis II, SLLA, SSA – depending on program)
 - b. GPA
 - c. Summary analysis of candidates' portfolio performance and resulting faculty program improvement goals, plans, timelines, names of individuals involved in evaluating candidates' portfolios (including, subject-matter faculty involvement)
13. Follow-up survey data from Graduates (disaggregated by program and delivery site)
14. Follow-up survey data from Employers (disaggregated by program and delivery site)
15. Membership, authority, and responsibilities of whatever advisory body has responsibility for the program (MoSTEP 7) **Note: The definition of "professional community" includes, at minimum, faculty from education, subject-area studies, and K-12 community.**
16. Descriptions of the resources (fiscal & instructional) available to the program (MoSTEP 8) highlighting comparison of the program to other programs within the unit and to comparable programs elsewhere within the institution.

Selection and Appointment of the Examining Team Members

Approximately sixty (60) days before the scheduled visit, DESE will send to the institution the list of MoSTEP examiners tentatively selected for the site visit. Within ten (10) days, the institution should respond to DESE with any concerns regarding the composition of its assigned examining team. Barring any problems the unit may have regarding the team composition, DESE will finalize the institution's team roster and confirm it with the unit.

MoSTEP requires that Examining Team members shall be comprised of 4-8 practicing, certificated school personnel (such as teachers, administrators, counselors, librarians) with three or more years of successful experience in Missouri schools and an earned master's degree, as well as teacher educators or administrators from institutions with state-approved programs. The size of the team depends upon the number of certification programs and portfolios to be examined. The team will also include a representative selected by the Missouri Department of Higher Education (DHE). As far as is practicable the team should reflect a balance of teacher educators and practicing, certificated educators (Note: in event that other professional programs begin to submit portfolios, e.g., administrators, team composition might need to be altered to include IHE faculty and school professionals (e.g., building administrators) appropriate to the population of the program seeking approval. IHE faculty should come from similar institutions but from different regions of the state as is practical.

Unit and Program Documentation Reviewed Prior to and During the Site Visit

Site visits are not "fishing expeditions" trying to catch a unit in mistakes. Rather, the site visit is a careful and professional "critical friend" activity intended to validate the unit's work and assist the unit in continuous renewal of its curriculum and programs. In service to this critical friend work, team members will spend substantial amounts of time reading documentation provided by the institution to form early impressions and develop issues and questions to be pursued in interviews and within other sources during the visit itself. Such early reviews help focus the site visit. To aid this, prior to and during the site visit, team members will be reviewing a number of pieces of documentation provided by the institution.

At least **fourteen (14) days in advance of the pre-visit meeting**, the institution should send the Examining Team chair and the DESE consultant a copy (or draft) of the Institutional Report (IR) for their review. At least **twenty-one (21) days in advance of the site visit**, the institution should send all examining team members a copy of the Institutional Report and other information pertaining to the review. Instead of hard-copy documents, the institution might put the IR and other related documents on a dedicated web site or send them on a CD. Team members will review these documents prior to arriving at the institution. From this information, the team members will begin to develop a sense of the Unit's mission and conceptual framework, how programs are structured, the kinds of clinical experiences required of candidates, and expectations held for the candidates. Moreover, team

members should be able to get a first glance at the demographic makeup of the Unit/campus and the faculty makeup and workload. Questions that arise in a team member's mind during this early review will help to provide focus for the site visit.

MoSTEP teams begin their evaluation of programs and the Unit by reviewing programmatic data. No single data source either dooms or saves a program; rather, team members will view the entire data set holistically in order to identify patterns across the data and to identify questions to pursue via other program documentation (e.g., syllabi, conceptual framework, curriculum matrices, faculty vitae, assessment data, etc.) and via interviews with students, faculty, administrators, and public school colleagues.

Examining team member's jobs are made easier or more difficult depending on the degree to which Unit and program faculty have

1. Compiled the data needed for the review,
2. Presented the data in easy-to-understand formats, and
3. Disaggregated and analyzed the data.

Over the course of the site visit, the team will examine at least the data available from the following sources for each program seeking approval:

- **INPUT DATA**
 - Curriculum Matrices for both subject-matter & pedagogy (See Appendices H & I)
 - Course Syllabi
 - Compliance with DESE Certification Requirements (Competencies, Courses & Credit-Hours)
- **PERFORMANCE DATA**
 - Test Results (*entrance*: C-BASE ¹, ACT/SAT, GRE/MAT; and *exit*: PRAXIS, SLLA)
 - Candidate Portfolios
 - Surveys of Graduates and Their Employers (based on MoSTEP "Quality-Indicators")
- **UNIT & PROGRAM REFLECTIVE ANALYSIS DATA**
 - Baseline Report (1998-1999 data)
 - Annual Report(s) (data and narrative submitted since the last site visit) (See Appendix J)
 - Institutional Report (site visit year)

The MoSTEP Standards intentionally establish both challenging goals and an expectation that programs must clearly articulate their objectives, continuously evaluate themselves against the performance of their graduates, and continuously evolve to improve the performance of future graduates. Therefore, members of an Examining Team have the dual responsibility of not only assessing the degree to which programs *currently meet* the Standards, but also of reflecting the degree to which programs are *moving toward meeting* the Standards.

As team members analyze data, they will be reminded to keep in mind the following

- What is the program doing to prepare educators to meet their performance expectations?
- Why is the program doing what it does in the ways it is doing it?
- How do program faculty know that what they are doing is working? What kind of assessment process have they implemented to find out? (*This is a MOST important component!*)
- What have they identified that could be working better?
- How are they defining goals, objectives, time lines, benchmarks, and milestones to track their implementation of these new ideas?

¹ For undergraduate programs, there is also the question of the degree to which the "General Studies" component contributes to the preparation of the beginning teacher (MoSTEP 1.1). C-BASE offers but one means for evaluating the impact of general studies; that is, it will give some indication of the impact of the communications, history, literature, mathematics, sciences, and the social sciences components of the general studies curriculum. It will not provide such an indication for the arts, philosophy, or multi-cultural and global perspectives components of the general studies curriculum. Therefore, units & programs need to identify and provide team members information on additional measures.

What will the examining team look for in entrance & exit test score data?

Purpose of Test Score Data: To reveal the program's impact on student learning – in this case, breadth of subject-matter knowledge.

What team members need to review test score data:

- Five years of data **disaggregated by program**
- State qualifying score for each test (provided by DESE)
- Number of students in each year who took the test and percent of test-takers who passed the test

What will the examining team will look for in follow-up survey data?

Purpose of Follow-Up Survey Data: To assess the opinions/perceptions of graduates and graduates' employers (e.g., building principals) on the effectiveness of their preparation program -- ***based on the Quality Indicators for their professional role*** (teacher, administrator, counselor, library/media specialist).

What team members need to review follow-up survey data:

- A copy of the survey instrument(s) (if the instrument(s) is not obviously organized according to the Quality Indicators for the field, the program and/or the Unit should provide team members a translation key.)
- Survey disaggregated by (a) program and (b) source of data (i.e., 1st year graduate, employer)
- An indication of the rate of response received by the program (e.g., 210 surveys were administered to elementary education graduates; 70 surveys were returned)
- The Unit's and program's analysis of the data

What will the examining teams look for in curriculum matrices?

Purpose of Curriculum Matrices: To reveal the degree to which programs are providing candidates sufficient opportunity to learn and practice what is expected of them as defined by the Quality and Performance Indicators for their job responsibility.

What team members need to review Curriculum Matrices:

- Curriculum Matrices for the prescribed Core Curriculum and for each program (See Appendices H & I), reflecting where in the course work students address the MoSTEP Quality Indicators for that program and the *Subject-Specific Competencies for the Beginning Teacher in Missouri*
Note1: The knowledge-base for Administrators and Counselors is identified within each of the Quality Indicators for their job responsibility.
Note2: Matrices must reflect all the courses that prepare students relevant to the competencies, including courses housed in other divisions of the campus (e.g., Arts and Sciences).
- Course Numbers & Titles
- Syllabus for each prescribed course in the program of study (including relevant courses in other campus divisions)

How will site team members verify compliance with certification requirements?

Purpose of verifying compliance: To verify that the program is requiring its students to take the courses (and the credit hours) stipulated by DESE's Certification Section and listed in the Unit's Approved Program Curriculum.

What team members need to verify compliance:

- Certification Requirements for the Content Area (provided by DESE)
- Courses of Study for each Program for Certification (frequently available as "Advising Sheets")
- Access to student transcripts

What will site teams look for in Annual Reports & the Institutional Report?

Purpose of MoSTEP Annual Reports: to document on a year-to-year basis qualitative and quantitative information about the Unit and its progress toward meeting the standards and to apprise DESE of that progress (See Appendix J)

Purpose of Institutional Report (Self-Study): to compile, analyze, and interpret Unit and program information since the last site visit

What Team members need to review Annual Reports & Institutional Reports:

- Copies of each of the reports submitted since the last site visit (normally part of the pre-visit packet of information sent to team members)

Standard-by-Standard Highlights

This section emphasizes particular information team members will be looking for in the information provided by the Unit and the individual programs residing within the Unit. But first, a few caveats about the information the Unit should provide team members in its reports, particularly the information provided in the Institutional Report.

1. Units should focus their narratives on those areas in which they
 - are exhibiting excellence,
 - are achieving a creative edge, and/or
 - are experiencing dilemmas.
2. Because the MoSTEP standards are not only new, but also because they represent a high standard, it is important to acknowledge Unit and program efforts to identify where they need improvement. Therefore, the Unit should be frank with the Team about what they perceive to be their own weaknesses. When team members are not convinced that some feature of a program or the Unit is meeting a standard, they will investigate how the program or the Unit intends to move forward. Clearly articulated goals, plans of action, and assessment strategies (e.g., those identified in the Annual Reports and the Institutional Report) may be evidence of a program moving in the right direction.
3. Team member's unit of analysis is the "standard" – not the individual "quality indicators" (**with the important exception of the Quality Indicators for Standards 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, & 1.5 used for determining candidate competencies**). This is an important distinction to keep in mind as team members are evaluating and writing about programs and the Unit. Because the page-limit constraints for the Institutional Report do not allow the Unit to write to each Quality and Performance Indicator, examining teams will weigh the preponderance of evidence presented for the standard.

Issues to address in the Unit's outline of the Institutional Report

Standard 1: Performance Standards for Education Professionals

Information that team members should expect to see relative to the standard:

Standard 1.1: General Studies

- Description and assessment of the general education component of the teacher's preparation

Standards 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5: Content, Professional, Pedagogical and Integrative Studies

- Curriculum matrices; portfolios; entrance & exit test scores; surveys of graduates and employers

Standard 2: Program and Curriculum Design

Team members should see descriptions and supporting documentation of the following:

- how the institution's and the Unit's mission statements are related to and supportive of each other; what faculty believe about teaching, learning, teachers, learners, and the communities in which schools reside and function
- an explication and application of the literature/research base upon which programs have been built; and how programs are using that knowledge base to design, assess, and continually improve programs

- how programs are structured (i.e., a curriculum design); the Unit's and the programs' expectations of students; and an identification of benchmarks by which candidates' progress through programs is assessed (i.e., benchmarks -- performance-based and traditional things like GPA)
- a description of whom was involved in shaping the Conceptual Framework and the roles they had in the process (advisory, rubber-stamping, contributing authors)
- how the Unit and individual programs have shared the Conceptual Framework with everyone with whom students come into contact (content area faculty & other campus units, partnering schools, cooperating teachers, field-placement cooperating teachers, students, building principals, etc.)
- a description of how, by what means, and on what schedule the Unit and its programs are **continuously evaluating** the Conceptual framework

Standard 3: Clinical Experiences

For each program, team members should see descriptions and supporting documentation of:

- when clinical experiences occur;
- how often (or on what schedule) they occur;
- in what ways students' clinical experiences ensure that they have interacted with a diverse student population;
- with what courses these experiences are associated;
- how the experiences are integrated into course work;
- who supervises and evaluates the student's performance in clinical experiences;
- by what criteria students are evaluated; and
- by what criteria, by whom, and on what schedule clinical sites are evaluated.

Standard 4: Candidates

Team members should see descriptions and supporting documentation of the following:

- recruitment plan -- including, but not limited to, recruitment for diversity
- admission process
- advising and retention procedures
- quantitative and qualitative (performance-based formative benchmarks) and how the Unit and programs are assessing them
- what the Unit and programs are doing for their graduates (i.e., BTAP)

Standard 5: Faculty

Team members should see descriptions and supporting documentation of the following:

- that faculty hold appropriate credentials (defined as Masters degree to teach undergraduates; terminal degree to teach graduate students); the requirement applies to adjuncts (e.g., a public school teacher hired to teach a methods course) and to subject-matter faculty who might, for example, teach a General Education math course that elementary majors are required to take
- that faculty are actively involved in the professional community in general and in particular that faculty are regularly involved in k-12 schools
- that the Unit has a recruitment plan -- including, but not limited to, recruitment for diversity
- that faculty are involved in teaching, scholarship, and service and that loads appear equitable and reasonable across the Unit and the institution
- that the Unit makes appropriate but minimal use of adjuncts
- that provisions, encouragement, opportunities, and processes are available to faculty for professional development
- that the institution and the Unit value quality teaching
- that faculty are incorporating diversity training, awareness, and strategies into every course
- that faculty -- both Education faculty & subject-matter faculty -- are modeling a variety of instructional strategies
- that faculty are modeling the integration of a variety of technologies into their teaching.

Standard 6: Governance

Team members should see evidence of the following:

- that the institution has committed itself to the preparation of teachers
- the unit has authority to manage its affairs

Standard 7: Professional Community

Team members need to see descriptions and supporting documentation of the following:

- breadth of membership in advisory committees (professional education faculty and students, public school colleagues, and subject-area faculty)
- roles, responsibilities, and authority afforded to those committees
- evidence that program curricula are evolving as a function of recommendations received from the professional community
- evidence of collaboration in the design, implementation, delivery, and evaluation of clinical experiences
- evidence that Unit, and ideally institutional, faculty are collaborating with public schools to improve the quality of P-12 education

Standard 8: Resources

Team members should see evidence of the following:

- that the Unit and programs have sufficient funding to operate and staff reasonably
- that the Unit is receiving funding comparable to other units/divisions within the institution
- that Unit and program instructional resources are current, with a particular emphasis on technology-based resources; and that faculty avail themselves of learning software

Judgments are made at the level of the **Standard**, not the Quality or Performance Indicator. (See Appendix B). These judgments are based on the preponderance of evidence presented during the site visit. The team will judge each program separately, indicating whether the standards are "met" or "not met." These then lead to the team making one of three recommendations for each program: "approval," "conditional approval," or "denial of approval." Findings and recommendations are compiled into a final report to the MSBE, which acts upon the team's recommendations. These actions are subsequently reported to the institution and unit.

It is important to remember that the program approval process has been conceived as and should be implemented as a formative evaluation of the Unit and its programs. The intention is to offer the Unit a critical, professional review of its programs, so it may be assured it is meeting standards for best practice and performance. The process is also intended to offer the unit technical assistance as it seeks to continually review and renew its professional programs. With this in mind, the team will use a critical eye, tempered by professional knowledge and respect for the "real" in contrast to the "ideal".

Conducting the Site Visit

When the Site Team arrives on campus, the members should be able to immediately begin their work. Based on their reading of the pre-visit packet, the members should already have begun to develop questions and areas of interest to help focus the site visit. While on site, then, the team members will look more closely at the Unit and its programs by reviewing portfolios, other documentation and exhibits, conducting interviews, touring campus buildings, sitting in on classes, and visiting off-site locations. All the findings from this work and previous reading should give team members all the information needed to write about the standards and programs and make recommendations relevant to their adequacy in meeting the standards set for them.

In general, the site visit follows a common schedule, though some differences may occur on any given site visit because of particular circumstances or changes negotiated during the pre-visit to the institution. The Sample Site Visit Schedule depicts a visit beginning on a Saturday afternoon and concluding at noon the following Wednesday. (See Appendix L)

Interviews

The bulk of Monday and Tuesday of the site visit is spent in interviews, on- and off-campus. The team should interview faculty, administrators, candidates, cooperating teachers, graduates, principals, and other members of the professional community. The team chair will ask the Unit liaison to arrange the required interviews, but the Unit has the option of suggesting additional interviews to the team chair for possible inclusion. All interviews should be scheduled and arranged by the Unit liaison prior to the site visit. Team members should receive from the Unit a schedule of these interviews, including the names of people expected to attend each interview. Site Team members may request additional interviews (for follow-up or based on findings within the documentation). The team chair will forward these requests to the Unit liaison to make arrangements.

In general interviews are conducted by at least two team members; to best use time, team members may decide to have fewer interviewers in any given interview session, especially individual interviews. The number of people to be interviewed at one time should not be more than 10 except for student groups or open faculty sessions. Most interviews may be scheduled for 30 minutes, although some group interviews will require more time and should be allowed 45 minutes to one hour.

The Interview Schedule Template (See Appendix M) will help in planning the interview schedule. Complete the template with the interviews agreed upon in the previsit meeting and include it in the pre-visit packet sent to team members prior to the site visit.

Classroom Observations

Team members will likely be visiting professional education classes to understand better the quality of teaching and the use of technology within the Unit and its programs. These observations can help inform, clarify or validate the members' findings and perceptions about curriculum and instructional practices. The Unit is responsible for letting faculty know that team members may visit classes during the visit. Moreover, the Unit should provide a schedule of classes available on Monday and Tuesday of the site visit.

Visits to Field Sites

Team members will visit between two and four off-campus sites (schools) where student teachers are assigned and with whom the Unit has established professional relationships. The Unit should provide a list of schools to be visited, their demographic characteristics, distance from campus, and the type of school. The team chair and site visit coordinator will select these schools during the pre-visit, and the Unit should arrange the visits with the schools in advance of the site visit. In general, these visits ought to represent a cross-section of the sites used by the Unit for its student teaching placements.

One or two team members will be assigned to each of the selected schools for a visit on Monday and/or Tuesday morning. The site visit coordinator should arrange for transportation to and from the school sites. During the visits, principals and cooperating teachers are interviewed regarding the quality of the Unit's programs and the candidates coming out of those programs as student teachers. In most instances, team members will observe student teachers in the classroom; however, they may simply be interviewed regarding their experiences. The school visits should also provide information about how field experiences are arranged, managed, and supervised. This is a good opportunity to explore the nature of the Unit's relationship to the professional community.

Branch Campuses, Off-campus Programs, and Distance Learning Programs

Branch Campuses. An institution with dependent branch campuses (i.e., campuses not holding separate institutional accreditation) will be reviewed as a part of the home unit, with the expectation that program quality and candidate expectations will be consistent across campuses. The program approval decisions and any cited weaknesses or unmet standards for any campus site will apply to the entire unit, even if cited deficiencies are specific to a specific campus.

Off-campus Programs. When a unit includes off-campus sites as part of their professional education program delivery system, then each site is expected to maintain the same level of quality for program expectations, delivery systems, facilities, faculty, governance, professional community, field experience, and candidate support and quality. The following guidelines will guide the examining team as it reviews off-campus sites;

- What is the unit's commitment to the off-campus programs?
- Why does the unit offer off-campus programs?
- To what degree is the regular faculty used to deliver the programs?
- What are the qualifications of adjunct faculty?
- Is the curriculum and extension of what is offered on campus, or is it different? If different, why and how does it differ?
- What are the differences in delivery of on-campus and off-campus programs, and are those differences appropriate?
- Are the admissions requirements the same or different for off-campus programs, and are differences appropriate?
- How many students are enrolled in each off-campus program?
- How are off-campus programs financed? How are they administered?

Distance Learning Programs. Distance-learning programs must also meet MoSTEP standards at the same level of quality as programs offered through traditional means. If a unit offers distance-learning programs in professional education, the examining team will expect to interview – in person or by other means – program administrator(s), faculty, and candidates. The examining team will also expect to see assessment results, pass rates, and other performance data for distance learning programs in the unit's documentation and exhibits.

The Exit Conference

The exit conference occurs on the final day of the site-visit. It is attended by the MoSTEP team chair, the DESE representative, the Unit head, and members of the institutional administrative team. It is an opportunity for the examining team chair to report the team's findings for the Unit and its programs for certification, although the team chair will not elaborate on the team's findings at this time. The following format guides the exit conference:

- Expressions of Appreciation for the Unit's assistance and hospitality (Team Chair)
- Summary of the site-visit activities and General Findings
 - Ratings for compliance with Unit Standards (Team Chair)
 - Ratings and recommendations for individual programs (Team Chair)
 - Overview of the process and time lines for writing, sharing, rejoining, and submitting the Final Report to the institution and DESE, and scheduling the presentation to MSBE (State Consultant)
- Institutional Response (President, Dean, or Unit Chair)
- Conclusion and Thanks (Team Chair)

The MoSTEP Examiners' Report

The MoSTEP Examiners' Report represents the work, deliberation and thinking of the examining team, so the team is responsible for ensuring that the report is accurate, well-supported, and well-reasoned. In other words it must reflect the professional character and judgment required for such a weighty task and responsibility.

The MoSTEP Team Chairperson is responsible for compiling the Examiners' Report. However, each team member, including the chair, is responsible for writing a rationale and statements of strengths and areas for improvement, as necessary, for each standard and program that he or she is assigned. The team members will also record the consensus ratings ("MET" or "NOT MET") for each standard and program and the recommendation ("Approval," "Conditional Approval," or "Deny Approval") for each program for certification.

Approval means the program is approved and may continue recommending candidates for certification during the intervening five years until the next review.

Conditional Approval means the program has significant enough weaknesses to warrant close attention and revision by the unit, and it grants the unit two years before a follow-up visit to determine the final disposition of the program. This follow-up visit is arranged by the TES and normally does not include a full site team. The unit may continue to prepare candidates in the program while conditional approval status is in effect.

Deny Approval means the program has significant weaknesses sufficient to warrant rescinding its right to recommend candidates for licensure. With this, the program must cease operating at the close of the semester. Candidates in the program should be advised to change majors or seek completion of their programs elsewhere.

After the site visit, the team chair will assemble the individual report sections into a “first draft” of the *MoSTEP Examiners’ Report* and submit a copy to the institution’s unit head to examine and make factual corrections. A copy is also sent to the team members for proofing and to the DESE consultant. Within ten (10) days of its receipt, the institution will make its factual corrections to the *MoSTEP Examiners Report* draft and return it to the Educator Preparation Section (EPS) at DESE.

Within thirty (30) days following the site visit, the EPS will prepare a final official *MoSTEP Examiners’ Report* and send it to the unit head and other appropriate officials of the institution. For joint reviews, it also will be sent to the NCATE Team Chair and included as the *State Addendum to the Board of Examiners’ Report*, which is submitted to NCATE. The institution is urged to rejoin the report as a matter of course.

The team report and all information related to it is the property of the institution and will not be released or discussed without the prior written permission of the institution.

Institutional Rejoinder to the MoSTEP Examiners' Report

The head of the unit, is required to acknowledge receipt of the *MoSTEP Examiner's Report* and is given an opportunity to consult with faculty, department heads and the executive officers of the institution, and submit a response to it within thirty (30) days following the receipt of the *Report*. The institution's response may simply be a letter that indicates acceptance of the team’s findings or a rejoinder that may challenge or refute the findings. The unit can also submit supplemental materials pertinent to the facts and conclusions found in the *Report*.

The unit is urged to submit a rejoinder to the *MoSTEP Examiner's Report* to the Educator Preparation Section (EPS) of DESE. Information from the rejoinder can be a vital part of the evidence presented to the Missouri State Board of Education (MSBE) as it considers program approval. The EPS may affirm, revise, or remove citations of areas for improvement as it prepares summaries and recommendations submitted to the MSBE, based on evidence provided in the rejoinder. Moreover, the EPS may change the team's decisions regarding met or unmet standards or programs if the institution’s rejoinder supports a different decision than the information in the *Report*.

The purpose of the rejoinder is to respond to statements indicating lack of compliance with standards or programmatic weaknesses, as well as perceptions of erroneous statements in the narrative sections of the *MoSTEP Examiner's Report*. The rejoinder may also cite any procedural concerns regarding the visit. If the unit is contesting the judgments of the examining team, the rejoinder must indicate the grounds for such a stance and provide the available documentation to support its arguments. This information should be summarized, cited, and/or included in appendices, as appropriate. **It is recommended that the unit respond to all areas for improvement cited in the Examiner's Report with which the unit does not concur.** When the Unit does not respond to the weaknesses cited in the *Examiner's Report*, it will be assumed that the unit concurs with the examining team's conclusions.

APPENDIX A

Procedures for Initial Program Approval

MISSOURI STANDARDS FOR TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS (MoSTEP)

Procedures for Initial Approval of New Professional Education Programs

1. The institution shall submit a written proposal for the program(s) to the Director of Educator Preparation, Division of Teacher Quality and Urban Education, Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, P.O. Box 480, Jefferson City, MO, 65102-0480. The proposal should include the following:
 - a. a cover letter requesting approval for the new program(s) being proposed;
 - b. a Needs Summary and Impact Assessment;
 - c. responses to Standards 1-8 in the Missouri Standards for Teacher Education Programs (MoSTEP);
 - d. curriculum matrices illustrating the courses and experiences required by the institution that address the competencies in MoSTEP Standards 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, etc., including a syllabus for each professional education course in the prescribed program of study;
 - e. additional curriculum matrices illustrating the institution's prescribed courses and experiences for each program of certification being proposed (Examples: Elementary Education, grades 1-6; Middle School Science, grades 5-9; Art, grades 9-12; etc.), showing alignment the with professional certification requirements and Subject Specific Competencies for Beginning Teachers in Missouri;
 - f. a vita from each instructor for the proposed professional education courses;
 - g. a letter, with supporting documentation, from the chief executive officer of the institution indicating that the institution will support the professional education unit and its programs with sufficient personnel, facilities and financial resources to assure its compliance with the standards.
2. Program proposals will be reviewed as soon as possible when they are received. The institution will be contacted if any additional information is needed to process the request for approval.
3. If the proposal is determined to be viable, a representative from the Educator Preparation Section may conduct an initial site inspection at the institution.
4. If the institution's proposal is determined to be acceptable and the site inspection is satisfactory, a recommendation for interim approval will be made to the Missouri State Board of Education (MSBE) for its consideration, and if interim approval is granted, the institution may begin recommending candidates for state certification upon their completion of the program(s).
5. The institution will be notified in writing whether or not the proposed program has been approved.
6. Interim approval shall be in effect until a standard review of the unit and its program(s) is conducted and the results presented to the MSBE. If interim approval for a new professional education program is granted to an institution already having state approval for other programs, the approval period will parallel the expiration date of the other state-approved professional education programs at the institution.

For additional questions or clarification pertaining to any of the elements mentioned in this document, please contact the Educator Preparation Section in the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education by phone at (573) 751-0371.

APPENDIX B

The Standards

Missouri Standards for Teacher Education Programs (MoSTEP)

Category I. Design of Professional Education

Standard 1: PERFORMANCE STANDARDS FOR EDUCATION PROFESSIONALS

The unit ensures that candidates possess the knowledge, skills, and competencies defined as appropriate to their area(s) of responsibility.

1.1 General Education for Initial Teacher Preparation (Initial)

The unit ensures that candidates have completed general studies courses and experiences in the liberal arts and sciences.

Quality Indicators:

- 1.1.1 The general studies include the arts, communications, history, literature, mathematics, philosophy, sciences, and the social sciences.
- 1.1.2 The general studies incorporate multi-cultural and global perspectives.

1.2 Content, Professional, Pedagogical, and Integrative Studies for Teacher Preparation (Initial)

The unit ensures that candidates have completed a program of content, professional, pedagogical, and integrative studies.

Quality Indicators:

- 1.2.1 The preservice teacher understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry and structures of the discipline(s) within the context of a global society and creates learning experiences that make these aspects of subject matter meaningful for students.

Performance Indicators: The preservice teacher

- 1.2.1.1 knows the discipline applicable to the certification area(s) (as defined by Missouri State Subject Area Competencies)
 - 1.2.1.2 presents the subject matter in multiple ways;
 - 1.2.1.3 uses students' prior knowledge;
 - 1.2.1.4 engages students in the methods of inquiry used in the discipline;
 - 1.2.1.5 creates interdisciplinary learning.
 - 1.2.2 The preservice teacher understands how students learn and develop, and provides learning opportunities that support the intellectual, social, and personal development of all students.
- Performance Indicators:* The preservice teacher
- 1.2.2.1 knows and identifies child/adolescent development;
 - 1.2.2.2 strengthens prior knowledge with new ideas;
 - 1.2.2.3 encourages student responsibility;
 - 1.2.2.4 knows theories of learning.
 - 1.2.3 The preservice teacher understands how students differ in their approaches to learning and creates instructional opportunities that are adapted to diverse learners.

Performance Indicators: The preservice teacher

- 1.2.3.1 identifies prior experience, learning styles, strengths, and needs;
- 1.2.3.2 designs and implements individualized instruction based on prior experience, learning styles, strengths, and needs;
- 1.2.3.3 knows when and how to access specialized services to meet students' needs;
- 1.2.3.4 connects instruction to students' prior experiences and family, culture, and community.

- 1.2.4 The preservice teacher recognizes the importance of long-range planning and curriculum development and develops, implements, and evaluates curriculum based upon student, district, and state performance standards.

Performance Indicators: The preservice teacher

- 1.2.4.1 selects and creates learning experiences that are appropriate for curriculum goals, relevant to learners, and based upon principles of effective instruction (e.g., encourages exploration and problem solving, building new skills from those previously acquired);
- 1.2.4.2 creates lessons and activities that recognize individual needs of diverse learners and variations in learning styles and performance;
- 1.2.4.3 evaluates plans relative to long and short-term goals and adjusts them to meet student needs and to enhance learning.

- 1.2.5 The preservice teacher uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage students' development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills.

Performance Indicators: The preservice teacher

- 1.2.5.1 selects alternative teaching strategies, materials, and technology to achieve multiple instructional purposes and to meet student needs;
- 1.2.5.2 engages students in active learning that promotes the development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance capabilities.

- 1.2.6 The preservice teacher uses an understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior to create a learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.

Performance Indicators: The preservice teacher

- 1.2.6.1 knows motivation theories and behavior management strategies and techniques;
- 1.2.6.2 manages time, space, transitions, and activities effectively;
- 1.2.6.3 engages students in decision making.

- 1.2.7 The preservice teacher models effective verbal, nonverbal, and media communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the classroom.

Performance Indicators: The preservice teacher

- 1.2.7.1 models effective verbal/non-verbal communication skills;
- 1.2.7.2 demonstrates sensitivity to cultural, gender, intellectual, and physical ability differences in classroom communication and in responses to students' communications;
- 1.2.7.3 supports and expands learner expression in speaking, writing, listening, and other media;
- 1.2.7.4 uses a variety of media communication tools.

- 1.2.8 The preservice teacher understands and uses formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate and ensure the continuous intellectual, social, and physical development of the learner.

Performance Indicators: The preservice teacher

- 1.2.8.1 employs a variety of formal and informal assessment techniques (e.g., observation, portfolios of student work, teacher-made tests, performance tasks, projects, student self-assessments, authentic assessments, and standardized tests) to enhance and monitor her or his knowledge of learning, to evaluate student progress and performances, and to modify instructional approaches and learning strategies;
- 1.2.8.2 uses assessment strategies to involve learners in self-assessment activities, to help them become aware of their learning behaviors, strengths, needs and progress, and to encourage them to set personal goals for learning;
- 1.2.8.3 evaluates the effect of class activities on both individual and the class as a whole, collecting information through observation of classroom interactions, questioning, and analysis of student work;

- 1.2.8.4 maintains useful records of student work and performances and can communicate student progress knowledgeably and responsibly, based on appropriate indicators, to student, parents, and other colleagues.
- 1.2.9 The preservice teacher is a reflective practitioner who continually assesses the effects of choices and actions on others. This reflective practitioner actively seeks out opportunities to grow professionally and utilizes the assessment and professional growth to generate more learning for more students.
Performance Indicators: The preservice teacher
- 1.2.9.1 applies a variety of self-assessment and problem-solving strategies for reflecting on practice, their influences on students' growth and learning, and the complex interactions between them;
 - 1.2.9.2 uses resources available for professional development.
 - 1.2.9.3 practices professional ethical standards.
- 1.2.10 The preservice teacher fosters relationships with school colleagues, parents, and educational partners in the larger community to support student learning and well-being.
Performance Indicators: The preservice teacher
- 1.2.10.1 participates in collegial activities designed to make the entire school a productive learning environment;
 - 1.2.10.2 talks with and listens to students, is sensitive and responsive to signs of distress, and seeks appropriate help as needed to solve students' problems;
 - 1.2.10.3 seeks opportunities to develop relationships with the parents and guardians of students, and seeks to develop cooperative partnerships in support of student learning and well-being;
 - 1.2.10.4 identifies and uses the appropriate school personnel and community resources to help students reach their full potential.
- 1.2.11 The preservice teacher understands theories and applications of technology in educational settings and has adequate technological skills to create meaningful learning opportunities for all students.
Performance Indicators: The preservice teacher
- 1.2.11.1 demonstrates an understanding of instructional technology concepts and operations;
 - 1.2.11.2 plans and designs effective learning environments and experiences supported by informational and instructional technology;
 - 1.2.11.3 implements curriculum plans that include methods and strategies for applying informational and instructional technology to maximize student learning;
 - 1.2.11.4 uses technological applications to facilitate a variety of effective assessment and evaluation strategies;
 - 1.2.11.5 uses technology to enhance personal productivity and professional practice;
 - 1.2.11.6 demonstrates an understanding of the social, ethical, legal, and human issues surrounding the use of technology in PK-12 schools and applies that understanding in practice.

1.3 Professional Competencies for School Administrator Preparation (Advanced)

- 1.3.1 A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by the school community.

Knowledge: The administrator has knowledge and understanding of

- learning goals in a pluralistic society
- the principles of developing and implementing strategic plans
- systems theory
- information sources, data collection, and data analysis strategies
- effective communication
- effective consensus-building and negotiation skills

Dispositions: The administrator believes in, values, and is committed to

- the educability of all
- a school vision of high standards of learning
- continuous school improvement
- the inclusion of all members of the school community
- ensuring that students have the knowledge, skills, and values needed to become successful adults
- a willingness to continuously examine one's own assumptions, beliefs, and practices
- doing the work required for high levels of personal and organization performance

Performances: The administrator facilitates processes and engages in activities ensuring that:

- the vision and mission of the school are effectively communicated to staff, parents, students, and community members
- the vision and mission are communicated through the use of symbols, ceremonies, stories, and similar activities
- the core beliefs of the school vision are modeled for all stakeholders
- the vision is developed with and among stakeholders
- the contributions of school community members to the realization of the vision are recognized and celebrated
- progress toward the vision and mission is communicated to all stakeholders
- the school community is involved in school improvement efforts
- the vision shapes the educational programs, plans, and actions
- an implementation plan is developed in which objectives and strategies to achieve the vision and goals are clearly articulated
- assessment data related to student learning are used to develop the school vision and goals
- relevant demographic data pertaining to students and their families are used in developing the school mission and goals
- barriers to achieving the vision are identified, clarified, and addressed
- needed resources are sought and obtained to support the implementation of the school mission and goals
- existing resources are used in support of the school vision and goals
- the vision, mission, and implementation plans are regularly monitored, evaluated, and revised

- 1.3.2 A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth.

Knowledge: The administrator has knowledge and understanding of:

- student growth and development
- applied learning theories
- applied motivational theories

- curriculum design, implementation, evaluation, and refinement
- principles of effective instruction
- measurement, evaluation, and assessment strategies
- diversity and its meaning for educational programs
- adult learning and professional development models
- the change process for systems, organizations, and individuals
- the role of technology in promoting student learning and professional growth
- school cultures

Dispositions: The administrator believes in, values, and is committed to

- student learning as the fundamental purpose of schooling
- the proposition that all students can learn
- the variety of ways in which students can learn
- life long learning for self and others
- professional development as an integral part of school improvement
- the benefits that diversity brings to the school community
- a safe and supportive learning environment
- preparing students to be contributing members of society

Performances: The administrator facilitates processes and engages in activities ensuring that:

- all individuals are treated with fairness, dignity, and respect
- professional development promotes a focus on student learning consistent with the school vision and goals
- students and staff feel valued and important
- the responsibilities and contributions of each individual are acknowledged
- barriers to student learning are identified, clarified, and addressed
- diversity is considered in developing learning experiences
- life long learning is encouraged and modeled
- there is a culture of high expectations for self, student, and staff performance
- technologies are used in teaching and learning
- student and staff accomplishments are recognized and celebrated
- multiple opportunities to learn are available to all students
- the school is organized and aligned for success
- curricular, co-curricular, and extra-curricular programs are designed, implemented, evaluated, and refined
- curriculum decisions are based on research, expertise of teachers, and the recommendations of learned societies
- the school culture and climate are assessed on a regular basis
- a variety of sources of information is used to make decisions
- student learning is assessed using a variety of techniques
- multiple sources of information regarding performance are used by staff and students
- a variety of supervisory and evaluation models is employed
- pupil personnel programs are developed to meet the needs of students and their families

- 1.3.3 A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by ensuring management of the organization, operations, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment.

Knowledge: The administrator has knowledge and understanding of

- theories and models of organizations and the principles of organizational development
- operational procedures at the school and district level
- principles and issues relating to school safety and security
- human resources management and development
- principles and issues relating to fiscal operations of school management

- principles and issues relating to school facilities and use of space
- legal issues impacting school operations
- current technologies that support management functions

Dispositions: The administrator believes in, values, and is committed to:

- making management decisions to enhance learning and teaching
- taking risks to improve schools
- trusting people and their judgments
- accepting responsibility
- high-quality standards, expectations, and performances
- involving stakeholders in management processes
- a safe environment

Performances: The administrator facilitates processes and engages in activities ensuring that

- knowledge of learning, teaching, and student development is used to inform management decisions
- operational procedures are designed and managed to maximize opportunities for successful learning
- emerging trends are recognized, studied, and applied as appropriate
- operational plans and procedures to achieve the vision and goals of the school are in place
- collective bargaining and other contractual agreements related to the school are effectively managed
- the school plant, equipment, and support systems operate safely, efficiently, and effectively
- time is managed to maximize attainment of organizational goals
- potential problems and opportunities are identified
- problems are confronted and resolved in a timely manner
- financial, human, and material resources are aligned to the goals of schools
- the school acts entrepreneurially to support continuous improvement
- organizational systems are regularly monitored and modified as needed
- stakeholders are involved in decisions affecting schools
- responsibility is shared to maximize ownership and accountability
- effective problem-framing and problem-solving skills are used
- effective conflict resolution skills are used
- effective group-process and consensus-building skills are used
- effective communication skills are used
- a safe, clean, and aesthetically pleasing school environment is created and maintained
- human resource functions support the attainment of school goals
- confidentiality and privacy of school records are maintained

- 1.3.4 A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by collaborating with families and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources.

Knowledge: The administrator has knowledge and understanding of:

- emerging issues and trends that potentially impact the school community
- the conditions and dynamics of the diverse school community
- community resources
- community relations and marketing strategies and processes
- successful models of school, family, business, community, government and higher education partnerships

Dispositions: The administrator believes in, values, and is committed to:

- schools operating as an integral part of the larger community
- collaboration and communication with families

- involvement of families and other stakeholders in school decision-making processes
- the proposition that diversity enriches the school
- families as partners in the education of their children
- the proposition that families have the best interests of their children in mind
- resources of the family and community needing to be brought to bear on the education of students
- an informed public

Performances: The administrator facilitates processes and engages in activities ensuring that:

- high visibility, active involvement, and communication with the larger community is a priority
- relationships with community leaders are identified and nurtured
- information about family and community concerns, expectations, and needs is used regularly
- there is outreach to different business, religious, political, and service agencies and organizations
- credence is given to individuals and groups whose values and opinions may conflict
- the school and community serve one another as resources
- available community resources are secured to help the school solve problems and achieve goals
- partnerships are established with area businesses, institutions of higher education, and community groups to strengthen programs and support school goals
- community youth family services are integrated with school programs
- community stakeholders are treated equitably
- diversity is recognized and valued
- effective media relations are developed and maintained
- a comprehensive program of community relations is established
- public resources and funds are used appropriately and wisely
- community collaboration is modeled for staff
- opportunities for staff to develop collaborative skills are provided

- 1.3.5 A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner.

Knowledge: The administrator has knowledge and understanding of:

- the purpose of education and the role of leadership in modern society
- various ethical frameworks and perspectives on ethics
- the values of the diverse school community
- professional codes of ethics
- the philosophy and history of education

Dispositions: The administrator believes in, values, and is committed to:

- the ideal of the common good
- the principles in the Bill of Rights
- the right of every student to a free, quality education
- bringing ethical principles to the decision-making process
- subordinating one's own interest to the good of the school community
- accepting the consequences for upholding one's principles and actions
- using the influence of one's office constructively and productively in the service of all students and their families
- development of a caring school community

Performances: The administrator:

- examines personal and professional values
- demonstrates a personal and professional code of ethics

- demonstrates values, beliefs, and attitudes that inspire others to higher levels of performance
- serves as a role model
- accepts responsibility for school operations
- considers the impact of one's administrative practices on others
- uses the influence of the office to enhance the educational program rather than for personal gain
- treats people fairly, equitably, and with dignity and respect
- protects the rights and confidentiality of students and staff
- demonstrates appreciation for and sensitivity to the diversity in the school community
- recognizes and respects the legitimate authority of others
- examines and considers the prevailing values of the diverse school community
- expects that others in the school community will demonstrate integrity and exercise ethical behavior
- opens the school to public scrutiny
- fulfills legal and contractual obligations
- applies laws and procedures fairly, wisely, and considerately

1.3.6 A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context.

Knowledge: The administrator has knowledge and understanding of:

- principles of representative governance that undergird the system of American schools
- the role of public education in developing and renewing a democratic society and an economically productive nation
- the law as related to education and schooling
- the political, social, cultural and economic systems and processes that impact schools
- models and strategies of change and conflict resolution as applied to the larger political, social, cultural and economic contexts of schooling
- global issues and forces affecting teaching and learning
- the dynamics of policy development and advocacy under our democratic political system
- the importance of diversity and equity in a democratic society

Dispositions: The administrator believes in, values, and is committed to:

- education as a key to opportunity and social mobility
- recognizing a variety of ideas, values, and cultures
- importance of a continuing dialogue with other decision makers affecting education
- actively participating in the political and policy-making context in the service of education
- using legal systems to protect student rights and improve student opportunities

Performances: The administrator facilitates processes and engages in activities ensuring that

- the environment in which schools operate is influenced on behalf of students and their families
- communication occurs among the school community concerning trends, issues, and potential changes in the environment in which schools operate
- there is ongoing dialogue with representatives of diverse community groups
- the school community works within the framework of policies, laws, and regulations enacted by local, state, and federal authorities
- public policy is shaped to provide quality education for students
- lines of communication are developed with decision makers outside the school community

1.4 Professional Competencies for School Counselor Preparation (Initial and Advanced)

- 1.4.1 The professional school counselor candidate knows and understands learners and how they develop, and facilitates learners' academic, interpersonal, social and career growth.

Quality Indicators:

- 1.4.1.1 Human Growth and Development: The professional school counselor candidate knows and understands human development and personality and how these domains affect learners, and applies this knowledge in his or her work with learners.

Performance Indicators: The professional school counselor candidate:

- applies theories of individual and family development, transitions across the life span, and the range of human developmental variation
- applies knowledge of developmental stages of individual growth
- applies theories of learning and personality development
- applies factors that affect behavior, including but not limited to, developmental crises, disability, addiction, psychopathology, and environmental factors, in assisting learners to develop healthy life and learning styles
- applies developmental principles in working with learners in a variety of school counseling activities

- 1.4.1.2 Culture and Diversity: The professional school counselor candidate knows and understands how human diversity affects learning and development within the context of a global society and a diverse community of families. The professional school counselor candidate uses this understanding to assist learners, parents, and colleagues in developing opportunities for learning and personal growth.

Performance Indicators: The professional school counselor candidate:

- knows and understands multicultural and pluralistic trends
- knows and understands attitudes and behaviors related to diversity, and how the diversity in families
- impacts learners
- educates students, colleagues and others about diversity and its impact on learning, growth, and relationships
- facilitates the development of learners' tolerance and respect for, and valuing of, human diversity
- knows and understands how culture affects the counseling relationship and demonstrates cultural awareness and sensitivity in counseling

- 1.4.1.3 Assessment: The professional school counselor candidate knows and understands the principles of measurement and assessment, for both individual and group approaches, and applies these in working with all learners.

Performance Indicators: The professional school counselor candidate:

- knows and understands theoretical and historical bases for assessment techniques
- knows and understands the concepts of reliability and validity
- selects, administers, and interprets assessment and evaluation instruments and techniques in counseling
- applies assessment results to the counseling process
- knows, understands and applies ethical principles in assessment

- 1.4.1.4 Career Development and Planning: The professional school counselor candidate understands career development and planning processes across the lifespan, and assists all learners in their career exploration, decision-making and planning.

Performance Indicators: The professional school counselor candidate:

- knows and understands theories of career development, career decision-making and planning selects and applies career counseling models with learners

- promotes and supports the career decision-making and planning of learners
- uses various career assessment techniques to assist learners in understanding their abilities and career interests
- uses current career information to assist learners in understanding the world of work and making career plans and choices

1.4.2 The professional school counselor candidate promotes learners' growth and development through a district wide, comprehensive model for guidance and counseling for all students.

Quality Indicators:

1.4.2.1 Guidance Curriculum: The professional school counselor candidate knows, understands, and uses classroom guidance methods and techniques.

Performance Indicators: The professional school counselor candidate:

- knows, understands, and conducts guidance needs assessments
- collaborates with other school personnel in the delivery of the guidance curriculum
- designs and implements developmentally appropriate guidance activities

1.4.2.2 Individual Planning: The professional school counselor candidate knows, understands, and uses planning and goal setting for the personal, educational, and career development of the learner.

Performance Indicators: The professional school counselor candidate:

- knows and understands planning and goal setting processes
- uses various tools, including technology, to assist learners in personal, educational, and career goal setting and planning.

1.4.2.3 Responsive Services: The professional school counselor candidate knows, understands and uses various methods for delivering responsive counseling services to learners in the school community

Performance Indicators: The professional school counselor candidate:

- knows and understands a variety of individual and small group counseling theories and techniques
- knows and understands a variety of crisis intervention and consultation theories and techniques
- selects and uses counseling interventions appropriate to the needs of learners
- uses appropriate referral resources and procedures

1.4.2.4 System Support: The professional school counselor candidate knows, understands and uses various methods to develop and maintain a comprehensive guidance program that serves the needs of all learners.

Performance Indicators: The professional school counselor candidate:

- knows, understands, develops, and manages a comprehensive guidance program for all learners
- advocates for the guidance program throughout the school community
- knows, understands, and conducts program evaluation to monitor and improve the guidance program

1.4.2.5 Technology: The professional school counselor candidate knows, understands and uses technology as a management and counseling tool in promoting the personal, educational, social, and career development of the learner.

Performance Indicators: The professional school counselor candidate:

- knows, understands and uses a variety of technology in the delivery of guidance and counseling activities
- uses technology to manage a comprehensive guidance program

- 1.4.3 The professional school counselor candidate develops and promotes professional relationships in the school, family, and community

Quality Indicators:

- 1.4.3.1 The professional school counselor candidate understands, develops, and uses professional relationships in the school, family and community, through consultation and collaboration, to promote development of all learners.

Performance Indicators: The professional school counselor candidate:

- knows, understands and uses consultation strategies to improve communication and promote teamwork
- uses consultation strategies to coordinate resources and efforts of teachers, administrators, and support staff
- uses consultation strategies to promote school-home relationships through involvement of parents and other family members
- uses consultation methods with private and public agencies in the community that may be involved in the learner's development

- 1.4.4 The professional school counselor candidate knows, understands, and adheres to ethical, legal, and professional standards.

Quality Indicators:

- 1.4.4.1 Ethical: The professional school counselor candidate knows, understands and practices in accord with the ethical principles of the school counseling profession.

Performance Indicators: The professional school counselor candidate:

- knows, understands and practices in accordance with the ethical principles of the counseling profession
- knows and understands the differences among legal, ethical, and moral principles
- knows, understands and practices in accordance with local school policy and procedures
- employs ethical decision-making models to recognize and resolve ethical dilemmas
- models ethical behavior in his or her work

- 1.4.4.2 Legal: The professional school counselor candidate knows, understands and adheres to the legal aspects of the role of the school counselor

Performance Indicators: The professional school counselor candidate:

- knows and understands the local, state, and federal statutory requirements pertaining to her or his work
- uses legal resources to inform and guide his or her practice
- practices in accordance with the legal restraints of local jurisdictions
- practices within the statutory limits of confidentiality

- 1.4.4.3 Professional: The professional school counselor candidate knows, understands and implements methods to promote his or her professional development and well-being.

Performance Indicators: The professional school counselor candidate:

- participates in professional organizations
- develops and implements a professional development plan
- uses personal reflection, consultation, and supervision to promote professional growth and development
- knows, understands, uses and models techniques of self-care
- evaluates her or his practice, seeks feedback from others, and uses this information to improve performance

1.5 Content, Professional, Pedagogical, and Integrative Studies for the Library Media Specialist (Initial and Advanced)

1.5.1 Use of Information and Ideas

Quality Indicators:

- 1.5.1.1 Efficient and Ethical Information-Seeking Behavior: Candidates apply a variety of strategies to ensure access to resources and information in a variety of formats to all members of the learning community.
- 1.5.1.2 Literacy and Reading: Candidates encourage reading and lifelong learning by fostering interests and competencies in the effective use of ideas and information.
- 1.5.1.3 Access to Information: Candidates promote efficient and ethical information-seeking behavior as part of the school library media program and its services.
- 1.5.1.4 Stimulating Learning Environment: Candidates demonstrate the ability to create a positive educational environment in a literate, technology-rich, and inviting library media center atmosphere.

1.5.2 Teaching and Learning

Quality Indicators:

- 1.5.2.1 Knowledge of Learners and Learning: Candidates design and implement instruction that engages the student's interests, passions, and needs which drive their learning.
- 1.5.2.2 Effective and Knowledgeable Teacher: Candidates model and promote collaborative planning with classroom teachers in order to teach concepts and skills of information processes integrated with classroom content.
- 1.5.2.3 Information Literacy Curriculum: Candidates partner with other education professionals to develop and deliver an integrated information skills curriculum.

1.5.3 Collaboration and Leadership

Quality Indicators:

- 1.5.3.1 Connection with the Library Community: Candidates provide leadership and establish connections with the greater library and education community.
- 1.5.3.2 Instructional Partner: Candidates demonstrate effective leadership principles and work with the learning community to create a productive educational environment.
- 1.5.3.3 Educational Leader: Candidates create school library media programs that focus on student learning and achievement; and encourage the personal and professional growth of teachers and other educators.

1.5.4. Program Administration

Quality Indicators:

- 1.5.4.1 Managing Information Resources: Selecting, Organizing, Using: Candidates apply knowledge and skills in building, managing, and providing free and equitable access to resource collections to enhance the school curriculum and offer leisure reading materials for the school community.
- 1.5.4.2 Managing Program Resources: Human, Financial, Physical: Candidates administer the library media program according to the principles of best practice in library science and program administration to support the mission of the school.
- 1.5.4.3 Comprehensive and Collaborative Strategic Planning and Assessment: Candidates apply leadership, collaboration, and technology skills to design and manage library media programs that are up-to-date, comprehensive, and integrated within the school.

Standard 2: PROGRAM AND CURRICULUM DESIGN (Initial and Advanced)

The unit has high quality professional education programs that are derived from a conceptual framework(s) that is knowledge-based, articulated, shared, coherent, consistent with the unit and/or institutional mission, and continuously evaluated.

Quality Indicators:

- 2.1 The conceptual framework(s) is written, well articulated, and shared among professional education faculty, candidates, and other members of the professional community.
 - 2.1.1 The framework(s) is defined and makes explicit the professional commitments, dispositions, and values that support it, including the commitment to acquire and use professional knowledge.
 - 2.1.2 The framework(s) includes a philosophy and purposes; provides an associated rationale for course work and field experiences; contains assessment statements of desired results for candidates; and provides for program evaluation.
 - 2.1.3 The framework(s) reflects multi-cultural and global perspectives.
 - 2.1.4 The framework(s) and knowledge bases that support each professional education program rest on established and contemporary research, the wisdom of practice, and emerging education policies and practices.
- 2.2 Coherence exists between the conceptual framework(s) and student outcomes, courses, field experiences, instruction, and evaluation.
- 2.3 The unit engages in regular and systematic evaluations (including, but not limited to, information obtained through student assessment, and collection of data from students, recent graduates, and other members of the professional community) and uses these results to foster student achievement through the modification and improvement of the conceptual framework(s) and programs.

Standard 3: CLINICAL EXPERIENCES (Initial and Advanced)

The professional education unit ensures that clinical experiences for initial and advanced programs are well-planned, early, on-going, integrated into the program sequence, of high quality, and continuously evaluated.

Quality Indicators:

- 3.1 Preservice preparation programs include clinical experiences in which candidates can observe and practice solutions to problems under the direction and supervision of qualified academic, school-based and clinical faculty.
- 3.2 The professional education unit selects clinical experiences, including student teaching and/or internships, to provide candidates with opportunities to relate principles and theories to actual practice. The clinical experiences will be varied and include study and practice in communities which include students of different ages and with culturally diverse and exceptional populations.
- 3.3 Clinical experiences encourage reflection by candidates and include feedback from a variety of sources close to the student's work, including higher education faculty, school faculty, clinical faculty, and administrators, students, and peers.
- 3.4 Clinical experiences allow candidates to experience all duties and responsibilities of the professional role for which they are preparing.
- 3.5 The professional education unit provides quality clinical sites in which candidates may develop the required knowledge and exhibit required performances.
- 3.6 Candidates seeking endorsements or licenses for more than one grade or developmental level shall be assigned to clinical experiences at such levels.

- 3.7 Culminating clinical experiences (student teaching, practicum, or internship) shall be at the level and in the endorsement area and license being sought by the candidate, and with a supervising teacher/mentor who holds certification in the appropriate area.
- 3.7.1 Culminating clinical experiences shall provide opportunities for increasing responsibility for planning and instruction and communication with the supervising professional(s), including reflection on teaching, learning, and behaviors.
- 3.7.2 When possible, the supervising school professional shall be selected collaboratively by the professional education unit and the site administrator.

Category II. Candidates in Professional Education

Standard 4: COMPOSITION, QUALITY, AND COMPETENCE OF STUDENT BODY (Initial and Advanced)

The unit has and implements written plans to recruit, admit, and retain a diverse student body who demonstrate potential for professional success in schools.

4.1. Diverse Student Body

The unit commits scholarships, outreach efforts, and other human and financial resources to ensure a diverse candidate pool (e.g., individuals of diverse economic, cultural, racial, gender, and linguistic backgrounds, and individuals with disabilities) with acceptable academic and other qualifications.

Quality Indicators:

- 4.1.1 The unit has and implements an explicit plan with resources explicitly devoted to recruiting, admitting, and retaining a diverse student body.
- 4.1.2 The unit's efforts and success in meeting goals for recruiting candidates from diverse backgrounds are evaluated annually, and steps are taken to strengthen, as necessary, its plans for future efforts.
- 4.1.3 The unit monitors admission decisions to ensure that the published admissions criteria are equitably applied to all applicants.

4.2 Qualification of Candidates

A comprehensive system is used to assess the qualifications of candidates seeking admission.

Quality Indicators:

- 4.2.1 The criteria for admission to undergraduate, graduate, and post-baccalaureate initial teacher preparation programs include a comprehensive (i.e., multiple forms of data) assessment of academic proficiency (e.g., basic skills proficiency tests), faculty recommendations, biographical information, and successful completion of any prior college/university course work with at least a 2.5 cumulative grade point average (GPA) on a 4-point scale, background screening, and background checks for felony conviction(s).
- 4.2.2 The criteria for admission to advanced programs include an assessment of academic proficiency (e.g., the MAT, GRE, and GPA), faculty recommendations, record of competence and effectiveness in professional work, and graduation from a regionally accredited college/university.
- 4.2.3 The unit has an admission policy for the following categories of students:
 - a) transfer students (including mutually agreed upon articulation with Missouri Community Colleges)
 - b) non-traditional students
 - c) diverse students

4.3 Monitoring and Advising the Progress of Candidates (Initial and Advanced)

The unit systematically monitors and assesses the progress of candidates toward program goals and ensures that they receive appropriate academic and professional advisement from admission through completion of their professional education programs. The program includes multiple, developmental, and diverse opportunities for growth.

Quality Indicators:

- 4.3.1 The unit has and uses developmental benchmarks to determine whether or not candidates have prerequisite knowledge and skill to advance to the next program level, ensuring that those who are not able to demonstrate proficiency at any point have opportunities appropriate to their individual learning needs to increase their level of proficiency.
- 4.3.2 The progress of candidates at different stages of programs is monitored through authentic performance-based assessments using systematic procedures and time lines, and students are advised about their progress.
- 4.3.3 Assessment of a candidate's progress is based on multiple data sources that include grade point average (GPA), observations, faculty recommendations, demonstrated competence in academic and professional work (e.g., portfolios, performance assessments, research and concept papers), and recommendations from appropriate professionals in schools.
- 4.3.4 Assessment data are systematically used to assist candidates who are not making satisfactory progress.
- 4.3.5 Criteria consistent with the conceptual framework(s) of programs and consistent with State Board standards (i.e., beginning teacher standards, beginning administrator standards) are used to determine eligibility for student teaching and other professional internships.
- 4.3.6 The professional education unit ensures that the State Board adopted basic skills assessments are successfully completed prior to student teaching or culminating field-based experiences (i.e., the successful completion of the prescribed Missouri State Board of Education exit examination).
- 4.3.7 Through publications and faculty advising, candidates are provided clear information about institutional policies and requirements, including assessment requirements and remediation strategies, needed for completing their professional education programs, the availability of social and psychological counseling services, and job opportunities.
- 4.3.8 The institution conducts systematic surveys of its current students and graduates in professional education in order to gather data pertaining to the effectiveness of its advisement. These data become the basis for improving those services.

4.4 Ensuring the Competence of Candidates (Initial and Advanced)

The unit ensures that a candidate's competency to begin a professional role in schools is assessed prior to completion of the program and/or recommendation for licensure.

Quality Indicators:

- 4.4.1 The unit establishes and publishes a set of criteria/outcomes for exit from each professional education program consistent with State Board of Education adopted performance standards.
- 4.4.2 A candidates's mastery of a program's stated exit criteria or outcomes is assessed through the use of multiple sources of data such as a culminating experience, portfolios, interviews, videotaped and observed performance in schools, standardized tests, and course grades.
- 4.4.3 The unit ensures that students exiting educator preparation programs have constructed a professional portfolio which contains evidence of learning accomplishments related to State Board of Education adopted performance standards. The portfolio shall contain evidence to verify knowledge, skills, and abilities, and application with various types of students and/or adults and in various settings. Such portfolio may include but need not be limited to (i) summaries of professional and student research, (ii) videotapes of actual performance in the student's area of

specialization or endorsement, (iii) examples of self-analysis and reflection of progress, (iv) formative and summative assessments of performance in academic, clinical, and field-based experiences, (v) and evidence of state-adopted licensing assessment results.

4.4.4 The institution administers the prescribed exit assessment as identified by the Missouri State Board of Education prior to the recommendation for certification.

4.4.5 The institution recommends for certification only individuals with a 2.5 overall grade point average who have successfully completed, the exit examination prescribed by the Missouri State Board of Education and other assessments required by the institution.

4.5 Ensuring the Support of Graduates (Initial and Advanced)

The unit ensures that graduates are well supported during their first two years of professional service.

Quality Indicators:

4.5.1 The institution provides follow-up support and tracking for all its first and second-year education professionals in the field, including such things as enabling them to meet together and share their ideas, needs, and information; supporting mentor teachers; and supporting district professionals and schools through visits and assistance where required and possible.

4.5.2 Plans for supporting new education professionals are cooperatively developed and implemented by the institutions, the novice professionals, mentor teachers (where appropriate), and school districts.

4.6 Meeting the Needs of the Profession (Initial and Advanced)

The unit ensures that the program continues to meet the needs of beginning professionals and their employers.

Quality Indicators:

4.6.1 The unit seeks and uses data and feedback from its graduates to improve the professional preparation program.

4.6.2 The unit seeks and uses data and feedback from employers of its graduates to improve the professional preparation program.

Category III. Professional Education Faculty

Standard 5: QUALIFICATIONS, COMPOSITION, ASSIGNMENTS, AND DEVELOPMENT OF PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION FACULTY, AND QUALITY OF INSTRUCTION

5.1 Faculty Qualifications

The unit ensures that the professional education faculty are qualified for their assignments and are actively engaged in the professional community.

Quality Indicators:

5.1.1 Professional education faculty (both full and part time) have demonstrated competence in each field of specialization that they teach.

5.1.2 Faculty in graduate professional education and in innovative/experimental programs have earned an appropriate terminal degree.

5.1.3 Faculty teaching or supervising teacher education students further their professional development through periodic, direct personal involvement in the schools in grades pre-kindergarten through 12. (Required by Missouri Statute 168.400.3, RSMo.)

- 5.1.4 Faculty in professional education seek to model and reflect the best practice in the delivery of instruction, including the use of technology.

5.2 Faculty Composition (initial and advanced)

The unit recruits, hires, and retains a diverse higher education faculty.

Quality Indicators:

- 5.2.1 The unit has and implements an explicit plan with resources devoted to recruiting, hiring, and retaining a diverse faculty.
- 5.2.2 The unit's efforts and success in meeting goals for recruiting a diverse faculty are evaluated annually.
- 5.2.3 Part-time or adjunct faculty have demonstrated experience and/or competence in education and are employed on a limited basis when they can make significant contributions to the programs.

5.3 Professional Assignments of Faculty (initial and advanced)

The unit ensures that policies and assignments allow faculty to be involved effectively in teaching, scholarship, and service.

Quality Indicators:

- 5.3.1 Work load policies and assignments accommodate faculty involvement in teaching, scholarship, and service, including working in P-12 schools, curriculum development, advising, administration, institutional committee work, and other internal service responsibilities.
- 5.3.2 Faculty teaching loads, including, student teaching supervision, overloads, and off-campus teaching, are limited to allow faculty to engage effectively in teaching, scholarship and service.

5.4 Faculty Development.

The institution shall support and promote professional education faculty development, and the unit shall have a systematic, comprehensive, and written plan for such experiences.

Quality Indicators.

- 5.4.1 The institution has in place policies, resources and practices which support and ensure that faculty members are growing professionally through advanced study, scholarly inquiry, and participation in activities closely related to their instructional assignment.
- 5.4.2 Faculty members are actively involved in local, state, national, and/or international professional associations in their area(s) of expertise and assignment.
- 5.4.3 Faculty are regularly evaluated in terms of their contributions to teaching, scholarship, and service.
- 5.4.4 Evaluations are used systematically to improve teaching, scholarship, and service of the higher education faculty within the unit.

5.5 Quality of Instruction

Teaching in the unit is of high quality, consistent with the conceptual framework(s), and reflects research and best practice.

Quality Indicators:

- 5.5.1 Higher education faculty use a variety of instructional strategies that reflect an understanding of different models and approaches to learning.
- 5.5.2 Instruction encourages the candidate's development of reflection, critical thinking, problem solving, and professional dispositions.
- 5.5.3 Teaching reflects knowledge about and experiences with diversity and exceptionalities.
- 5.5.4 Instruction is continuously evaluated, and the results are used to improve teaching within the unit.

Category IV. The Unit of Professional Education

Standard 6: GOVERNANCE, ORGANIZATION, AND AUTHORITY (Initial and Advanced)

Governing boards and administrators shall indicate commitment to the preparation of educational personnel, as related to the institution's mission and goals, by adopting and implementing policies and procedures supportive of programs for the preparation of professional educators.

Quality Indicators:

- 6.1 The control of the institution resides in a board of trustees or an otherwise designated board. The governing board establishes institutional philosophies and policies which promote sound educational programs. All policy decisions are recorded in writing.
- 6.2 A president, or an otherwise designated chief administration officer, makes provision for the performance of administrative functions affecting professional education programs.
- 6.3 The professional education unit is clearly identified, operates as a professional community, and has the responsibility, authority, and personnel to develop, administer, evaluate, and revise all professional education programs.
 - 6.3.1 The unit has responsibility and authority in such areas as faculty selection, tenure, promotion, and retention decisions; recruitment of candidates, curriculum decisions; and the allocation of resources for unit activities.

Standard 7: PROFESSIONAL COMMUNITY (Initial and Advanced)

The professional education community collaborates to improve programs for the preparation of school personnel and to improve the quality of education in the schools.

Quality Indicators:

- 7.1 Faculty who teach general education courses, content-area courses, and professional studies collaborate regularly with each other and with public schools and school-based professionals on the development, implementation and evaluation of PK-12 and professional education programs.
- 7.2 Clinical and other field-based experiences are collaboratively arranged. [*The unit has agreements with schools and other professionals to ensure that students are supported in the achievement of the program's goals.*]
- 7.3 The program gives candidates opportunity to develop an identity as a professional educator via activities that may include but are not limited to joining professional education organizations and attending professional conferences.

Standard 8: RESOURCES FOR OPERATING THE UNIT AND FOR SUPPORTING TEACHING AND LEARNING (Initial and Advanced)

8.1 Resources for Operating the Unit

The unit has sufficient facilities, equipment, and budgetary resources to fulfill its mission and offer quality programs.

Quality Indicators:

- 8.1.1 Budget trends over the past five years and future planning indicate adequate support for the programs offered in professional education.
- 8.1.2 Resources are allocated to programs in a manner that allows each one to meet its expected outcomes.
- 8.1.3 Facilities and equipment are adequate, functional, and well maintained.

8.2 Resources for Teaching and Scholarship (Initial and Advanced)

The unit has adequate resources to support teaching and scholarship by faculty and candidates.

Quality Indicators:

- 8.2.1 Support of professional development is at least at the level of other units in the institution.
- 8.2.2 Higher education faculty have well-maintained and functional office, instructional, and other space to carry out their work effectively.
- 8.2.3 Higher education faculty and candidates have training in and access to education-related electronic information, video resources, computer hardware, software, related technologies, and other similar resources.
- 8.2.4 Library resources provide adequate access, scope, breadth, currency, and multiple perspectives; they are systematically reviewed to make acquisition decisions.
- 8.2.5 Media, software, and materials collections are identifiable, relevant, accessible, and systematically reviewed to make acquisition decisions.
- 8.2.6 There are sufficient library and technical staff to support the library, instructional materials collection, and media/computer support services.

APPENDIX C

Rubrics for Unit Standards

APPENDIX D

Rubrics for Teacher Candidate Portfolios (Standard 1.2)

APPENDIX E

Rubrics for School Administrator Candidate Portfolios (Standard 1.3)

APPENDIX F

Rubrics for School Counselor Candidate Portfolios (Standard 1.4)

APPENDIX G

Rubrics for Library-Media Specialist Candidate Portfolios (Standard 1.5)

APPENDIX H

Curriculum Matrix Template for Professional/Pedagogical Competencies (MoSTEP 1.2)

APPENDIX I

Curriculum Matrix Template for Subject Knowledge Competencies (MoSTEP 1.2.1.1)

APPENDIX J

Sample Annual Report Form

**(Institutions should use the Annual Report Form for
the current year provided on the DESE website.)**

APPENDIX K

Previsit Agenda & Checklist

APPENDIX L

Sample Schedule for the Site Visit

APPENDIX M

Interview Schedule Template

APPENDIX N

Glossary